

79-0262/1

5 FEB 1979

DD/A Registry

File Personnel 2-2

STAT

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

Chief, Pictorial Services Branch, OCR

FROM: James H. McDonald
Director of Logistics

SUBJECT: Review of Employee Suggestion
No. 77-489

REFERENCE: Memo dtd 12 Jan 79 to DCI fm C/PSB/OCR,
same subject (ER 79-3136, DD/A 79-0262,
OL 9 0255)

1. The Director has reviewed your memorandum of 12 January 1979 and has referred it to me for reply. The Office of Logistics agrees that the improved use of Headquarters space is high on the list of Agency administrative problems to be solved. Your suggestion would alleviate some of the space congestion through the creative approach of centrally locating some of the Agency's support and service functions. However, weighed against these advantages would be the inherently high cost of construction in an inaccessible location, the noise, the dirt and the general inconvenience during this construction, and the subjectivity of the aesthetics of the new expansion. Also to be considered is the integration of this relatively small space increment in reference to our total space requirements, and the burden of the expansion on the existing Agency utility systems.

2. The interrelation of the above factors are complex, and can be subjective, particularly in the areas of cost benefit ratios and aesthetics, as we have addressed in correspondence over the past one-and-a-half years.

3. The professionals in the Agency's architect-engineer specialities maintain the position that aesthetics, utilitarian, and functional considerations, although more subjective and emotional than the cost considerations developed later in this memorandum, nonetheless join cost and argue against construction in the courtyard. The total area of the

OL 9 0255a

SUBJECT: Review of Employee Suggestion No. 77-489

courtyard is 36,400 square feet; 16,000 to 25,000 could be used effectively. The consensus is that the gain of up to 25,000 square feet, at high cost, and of partial benefit in reference to our needs, is not worth the loss of the central court. The specialists submit for consideration that true integration with the existing building would only be approximated, and only at a cost that could open the Agency to criticism. They submit that the most cost effective and functional method of meeting the Agency's requirements is through new construction on the Headquarters complex. They advise that in consideration of the totality of Headquarters needs and in accordance with effective fiscal management, Agency priority is best directed toward expansion via new construction at an independent location at the Langley complex, with rental space filling the slack until our needs can be met through construction.

4. To be more specific on cost, the salient items that could nearly double the cost over classical construction in a prime area follow:

a. Inaccessibility -- The maximum opening into the courtyard is a 7 foot by 2 foot 11 inch wide door. In 1973, through construction that was similar to what would be required by your suggestion, equipment was installed in the south courtyard to provide conditioned air to a computer room. The air-conditioning equipment had to be transported into the courtyard by a military helicopter. This represented an expensive, hazardous, personnel intensive, and noisy operation.

b. Utilities -- The power, heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning systems serving the Headquarters complex are generally taxed to the limits of reliability. These utility systems, particularly the power systems, could not support your recommended space expansion. Space and capacity constraints conspire to make the cost of retrofitting these utility systems to increase their capacity more expensive than the provision of equal capacity through the new construction of a separate and independent structure.

SUBJECT: Review of Employee Suggestion No. 77-489.

c. Architectural -- The view of the proposed structure's roof from floors 2 through 7 should be pleasing. Considering the requirements for security, heating, ventilating, air-conditioning, lighting, drainage, and plumbing, the provision of an attractive facility would be expensive to construct, operate, and maintain. The use of solar energy to offset operating costs through the use of either active or passive systems is not considered feasible at this time.

5. Your suggestion is well thought out, innovative and with merit, but is not considered the best alternative to meet our present and projected requirements. Your effort in developing and in communicating your idea is appreciated and has led to a careful analysis and review of our plans. Your suggestion will remain on file and be considered against future requirements.



James H. McDonald

cc: DDA ✓
ER

STA

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/01/29 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600050001-6

Approved For Release 2004/01/29 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600050001-6